DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 226 24 PS 005 889

TITLE	Providing for Visitors During Installation of an Educational Product: The SWRL Kindergarten Program Information Resource Centers. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Regional Library for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Communication (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-0756
PUB DATE	Jul 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-3727
NOTE	61p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Cost Effectiveness; Early Childhood Education; *Information Sources; Instructional Materials; *Kindergarten; Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Regional Programs; *Resource Centers; *School Personnel; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

Information Resource Centers (IRCs) were established to provide a means of informing the educational community about the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development Kindergarten Program (KP) and of developing generalizable installation procedures for research-based instructional products. Centers were composed of clusters of schools in five school districts located in different geographic areas. Each School district appointed a coordinator to assume responsibility for operation of the IRCs. The Laboratory coordinated efforts of IRCs by providing liaison support through dissemination of information to the Centers, visiting the sites, analyzing monthly reports, issuing public information regarding the KP and IRCs and providing training for IRC coordinators. The Centers provided visitors the opportunity to receive an orientation to the Program, to observe its use in a classroom and to confer with teachers and administrators of participating schools. Procedures and materials required to document activities of the IRCs and the outcomes resulting from their establishment were developed. Enumerative and evaluative data, in the form of visitor and IRC staff reaction, indicate that the Centers effectively attained the objectives for which they were developed. (Author)

ED 066226

Final Report

Grant No. OEC-0-71-3727

PROVIDING FOR VISITORS DURING INSTALLATION OF AN EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT: THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INFORMATION RESOURCE CENTERS

Southwest Regional Laboratory
For Educational Research and Development

Los Alamitos, California

July 1972

ABSTRACT

Information Resource Centers (IRCs) were established to provide a means of informing the educational community about the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development Kindergarten Program (KP) and of developing generalizable installation procedures for research-based instructional products. Centers were composed of clusters of schools in five school districts located in different geographic areas. Each school district appointed a coordinator to assume responsibility for operation of the IRCs. The Laboratory coordinated efforts of IRCs by providing liaison support through dissemination of information to the Centers, visiting the sites, analyzing monthly reports, issuing public information regarding the KP and IRCs and providing training for IRC coordinators. The Centers provided visitors the opportunity to receive an orientation to the Program, to observe its use in a classroom and to confer with teachers and administrators of participating schools. Procedures and materials required to document activities of the IRCs and the outcomes resulting from their establishment were developed. Enumerative and evaluative data, in the form of visitor and IRC staff reaction, indicate that the Centers effectively attained the objectives for which they were developed.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Communication

PS 005889

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-1-0756
PA-24

Final Report

Grant No. OEC-0-71-3727

PROVIDING FOR VISITORS DURING INSTALLATION OF AN EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT: THE SWRL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM INFORMATION RESOURCE CENTERS

Southwest Regional Laboratory
For Educational Research and Development
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, California

July 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Communication

Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
SCOPE OF WORK COMPLETION	2
Laboratory Obligations	2
SWRL/School District Obligations	6
School District Obligations	9
IRC FEEDBACK REPORTS	9
Visitor Characteristics	9
IRC Activities	10
Visitor Reactions	12
Visitor Comment Sheets	12
Follow-up Sheets	31
Coordinator Reactions	31
DEVELOPMENT FORMULATION IMPLICATIONS	33
IRC Benefits	33
Cost Analysis	33
Cost-per-unit analysis	33
Cost-of-extension analysis	34
Future IRC Establishment	34
APPENDIX A	35

INTRODUCTION

Early in 1971 the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL) was informed of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/United States Office of Education plans to stimulate wide-scale installation of verified instructional products. The SWRL Kindergarten Program (KP), already scheduled for use in more than 100 school districts in 15 states by 80,000 pupils during the 1971-72 school year, met the quality-verified development criteria. KP development documentation and complete sets of Program materials were sent to USOE to indicate SWRL's interest in HEW/USOE plans. USOE responded with on-site visits to observe the instructional program. Subsequently, SWRL maintained communication with representatives of the National Center for Educational Communication (NCEC) and the National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD) to determine what action was neeessary during the 1971-72 academic year to inform the educational community about the KP and its availability.

At the request of USOE, on June 8, 1971, SWRL submitted an application for research support to HEW/USOE proposing the establishment of SWRL Kindergarten Program Information Resource Centers.[1] The IRCs were to provide a means of further informing the educational community about the KP and a means for developing generalizable installation procedures pertinent to research-based instructional products. The proposal indicated that an IRC would consist of a school, cluster of schools, or a total district and would provide:

a. Scheduled KP orientation briefings for members of the educational community and organized lay groups.

b. Scheduled KP observation sessions at school sites.

c. Scheduled meetings for potential users with teachers and administrators using the KP.

d. Organized materials that provide information related to the objectives, content, and use of the KP instructional system; training system; support system; quality assurance system; installation system; and field tryout documentation.

The proposal also specified that data, appropriate for documenting activities of the IRCs and outcomes resulting from their establishment, would be collected.

---

[1]Documents and materials referenced in this report are available from the Laboratory.

On June 15, 1971, USOE/NCEC agreed to make funds available to SWRL to establish IRCs in five 1971-72 Non-Exclusive License (NEL) participating school districts. This agreement was finalized in a one-year Cost Reimbursement Contract. Article one of the special provisions of the contract specified the scope of work for which SWRL was responsible. Since the Laboratory had entered into joint agreements with school districts, the responsibilities were separated into obligations (1) assumed by SWRL, (2) assumed by SWRL and the school districts, and (3) assumed by the school districts. Development and operation of the SWRL Kindergarten Program Information Resource Centers are described below in terms of the contract scope of work provisions.

SCOPE OF WORK COMPLETION

Laboratory Obligations

The first statement specified that SWRL:

> Coordinate the establishment of five SWRL Kindergarten Program Information Resource Centers which will consist of a school, cluster of schools, or total school district.

Operation of five IRCs confirmed the Laboratory's fulfillment of this obligation. Procedures used to establish IRCs are described in a subsequent section of this report.

The next statement specified that the Laboratory:

> Identify, in consultation with OE personnel, five school districts to participate in the Office of Education Diffusion Program.

Criteria were established to facilitate selection of school districts by SWRL and USOE personnel. It was determined that characteristics of selected districts would include:

a. Location in different geographic areas serving a number of different pupil populations.

b. Easy accessibility to visitors within a broad geographic area.

c. Present use of the KP under conditions of the NEL.

d. Commitment to use of district funds for participation in the NEL Program for 1971-72.

e. Willingness to participate in the USOE diffusion program.

f. Capability for provision of administrative resources required to perform functions of an IRC.

School districts selected were the Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida; Phoenix Elementary District #1, Phoenix, Arizona; Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento, California; San Diego City Unified School District, San Diego, California; and the Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Illinois.

The third statement provided that SWRL:

> Contact the selected districts and negotiate conditions for participation in the Office of Education Diffusion Program.

On June 16, 1971, SWRL initiated communication, via telephone, with personnel of the districts. This initial communication concerned activities and financing of IRCs as well as the need for broad ethnic representation. The districts were informed that they would be reimbursed for SWRL KP materials purchased for IRC schools. Following expressions of interest in the IRC program, school district representatives were invited to a planning session regarding implementation and operation of IRCs. The meeting was held at SWRL on July 6, 1971. The session resulted, in part, in agreement by each district to participate in the IRC program in accordance with conditions of the USOE/SWRL contract.

The fourth statement of the Laboratory's obligations provided that SWRL:

> Train school district personnel to perform the Kindergarten Program-related Information Resource Center functions.

Training of district personnel selected as IRC coordinators included presentation and discussion of materials and procedures developed to prepare them as effective coordinators for IRC operation. Training was conducted on September 17, 1971, at SWRL and was attended by: Barbara Scott (Duval County School Board, Jacksonville, Florida), Helen Hadden (Phoenix Elementary District, Phoenix, Arizona), Tom McAllister (Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento, California), Marjorie Craig (San Diego City Unified School District, San Diego, California), and Vivian Najim (Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Illinois). Janet B. Coons, a representative of the Duval County School Board, also attended the training. The following outline summarizes training proceedings.

1. SWRL trainers welcomed district representatives and introductions were made.

2. A list of materials for IRC coordinators was presented and discussed.

3. IRC functions were discussed and the following printed materials explaining the functions were distributed:

a. A document clarifying the nature of IRCs: Information Resource Center: Is/Is Not.

b. A list of activities of the IRCs.

c. Copies of IRC announcement sent to newsletters.

4. Materials and procedures to be used for visitor briefings were presented, including:

a. A filmstrip and slidetape describing SWRL and the Kindergarten Program.

b. A verbal review of the Instructional Concepts Program, First-Year Communication Skills Program, and Instructional Support films.

c. Suggestions for exhibiting KP materials.

d. Printed materials contained in the IRC visitors packet:

1) An illustrated brief entitled The Kindergarten Program.

2) A newspaper reprint, Learning to Read in Kindergarten.

3) The Participant Observation Guide.

4) A list of questions often asked concerning the KP, with appropriate responses.

e. Information materials not included in visitor packets:

1) Program briefs for Instructional Concepts Program, First-Year Communication Skills Program, Parent-Assisted Learning, Tutorial, and Summer Reading.

2) Program documentation lists.

3) Copies of the SWRL Program Plan.

f. Suggestions for scheduling coordinator orientations, classroom observations, conferences with school personnel, and data collection.

5. Printed materials for data collection were distributed and data collection procedures were discussed. Materials distributed included:

a. A document explaining data collection procedures.

b. The Information Resource Center Log.

c. A copy of a Visitor Comment Sheet.

d. A Follow-up Letter.

e. An IRC Follow-up Sheet.

f. A copy of a Daily Appointment Log.

g. An IRC Monthly Report.

Training concluded with a question-answer session.

The fifth statement provided that the Laboratory:

> Assume responsibility for coordinating the five Information Resource Centers and provide liaison support.

SWRL coordinated activities of the IRCs through staff training, monthly reports, site visits, and dissemination of information of general interest to the various centers. IRC coordinators summarized activities in a report mailed to SWRL the last day of each month. This monthly report included all visitor comments and appointment records. A site-visit of each IRC was conducted during the contract year, with additional visits scheduled as necessary. SWRL also promoted and encouraged communication among the various centers and between centers and the Laboratory.

The Laboratory provided public information regarding the KP and IRCs. During September, 1971, SWRL sent letters containing information concerning the KP and IRCs to superintendents of selected school districts. Concurrently news releases containing similar information were sent to selected educational journals.

The sixth statement of responsibility specific to the Laboratory provided that SWRL:

> Assume responsibility for the preparation of information packets to be distributed by the Information Resource Centers and/or State Departments of Education as appropriate.

The Laboratory prepared packets of printed materials concerning the KP for distribution to IRC visitors. The packets included:

a. A brief describing the SWRL Kindergarten Program.

b. Individual briefs describing the Instructional Concepts Program, the First-Year Communication Skills Program, and each of the three instructional support programs.

c. A First-Year Communication Skills Program materials guide.

PS 005889

d. A reprint from the Minneapolis Tribune discussing the use of the KP in an Edina, Minnesota elementary school.

e. A Participant Observation Guide designed to make visitor observation of the KP more meaningful.

f. A list of questions, often asked about the KP, and responses.

g. A list of KP briefing materials and directions for obtaining them.

The final stated responsibility pertaining solely to the Laboratory was that SWRL:

> Develop procedures and materials required to document activities performed by the Information Resource Centers and the outcomes resulting from establishment of the Centers.

Such procedures and materials were developed by SWRL and distributed to the IRC coordinators. Procedures developed involved the collection of enumerative and evaluative data utilizing printed materials designed for that purpose. These materials included Information Resource Center Logs, Visitor Comment Sheets, Daily Appointment Logs, and Follow-up Sheets. An IRC Monthly Report form was developed to facilitate summarization of IRC activities.

SWRL/School District Obligations

Two responsibilities shared by the Laboratory and school districts were specified in the USOE/SWRL contract. The first provided that they:

> Select the Information Resource Center schools within each district.

SWRL and the participating school districts selected the following IRC demonstration schools:

a. Duval County School Board

- Spring Park School #72
- R.L. Brown School #148
- Jacksonville Beach Elementary School #144

b. Phoenix Elementary District #1

- Mary McLeod Bethune School
- Grace Court School
- Monterey Park School
- Ann Ott School

c. Sacramento City Unified School District

- Bowling Green Elementary School
- Clayton B. Wire Elementary School
- Earl Warren Elementary School
- O.W. Erlewine Elementary School

d. San Diego City Unified School District

- Barton Elementary School
- Emerson Elementary School
- Curie Elementary School
- Clay Elementary School

e. Springfield Public Schools

- Southern View School
- Marsh School
- Sandburg School
- Butler School

These schools provided pupils representing various ethnic groups and socioeconomic levels, thus permitting demonstration of the broad-based effectiveness of the KP.

The second statement of joint obligation provided that SWRL and the school districts:

> Develop the appropriate procedures to conduct the following Information Resource Center activities:
>
> a. Scheduling Kindergarten Program orientation briefings for members of the educational community and organized lay groups.
>
> b. Scheduling meetings with teachers and administrators using the Kindergarten Program.
>
> c. Scheduling Kindergarten Program observation sessions at school sites.

d. Organizing materials which provide information related to the objectives, content, and use of the Kindergarten Program instructional system, training system, support system, quality assurance program, installation system, and field tryout documentation.

The Laboratory prepared and distributed to IRC coordinators a suggested plan for scheduling orientations, meetings, and observation sessions for visitors. Guidelines established to help IRCs conduct activities indicated that IRCs should provide:

a. Suitable space to accommodate at least 25 visitors per session to participate in the KP orientation sessions, and facilities for district personnel assigned IRC responsibilities.

b. Regularly scheduled KP orientation sessions using the materials and procedures provided by the Laboratory.

c. At least three elementary schools to participate in a program of scheduled observations in the use of the KP in the classroom under natural conditions.

d. Opportunity for visitors to discuss the use of the KP with school personnel.

Materials were provided IRCs to facilitate dissemination of information concerning the KP. These materials included:

a. An outline describing activities of IRCs.

b. An information sheet describing IRCs.

c. A pamphlet describing methods of exhibiting KP materials.

d. Audiovisual aids developed by SWRL, including:

(1) A filmstrip and tape, with script, describing the KP.

(2) A filmstrip and tape, with script, describing the Laboratory.

(3) Films describing the Instructional Concepts Program, First-Year Communication Skills Program, and the Instructional Support Systems.

e. Program briefs for the Instructional Concepts Program, First-Year Communication Skills Program, and each of the support programs.

f. Copies of an annotated bibliography of available SWRL documents pertaining to the KP.

g. SWRL Program Plan.

School District Obligations

The USOE/SWRL contract specified three areas of responsibility for IRC school districts. The first of these stated that districts:

> Identify district personnel who will assume responsibility for the administration of the Information Resource Centers.

Each school district fulfilled this obligation by selecting qualified, capable, and enthusiastic members of their staff to be IRC coordinators. Coordinators selected were:

a. Barbara Scott, Duval County School Board.

b. Helen Hadden, Phoenix Elementary District #1.

c. Tom M. McAllister, Sacramento City Unified School District.

d. Marjorie Craig, San Diego City Unified School District.

e. Vivian Najim, Springfield Public Schools.

The second statement of specific responsibility was that school districts:

> Assume responsibility for the operation of the Information Resource Centers.

Each district legally assumed such responsibility by entering into a subcontract, specifying IRC operation requirements, with SWRL.

The third statement of responsibility for school districts provided that they:

> Assume responsibility for the collection of appropriate data required to document the activities of the Information Resource Centers and the outcomes resulting from establishment of the centers.

Each IRC has collected data using procedures and protocols provided by the Laboratory. Both enumerative and evaluative data were collected. These data were used to document IRC activities and outcomes resulting from establishment and operation of the centers.

IRC FEEDBACK REPORTS

Visitor Characteristics

During the contract year, 1,516 persons visited the IRCs. Of these, 1,387 represented public or private districts and schools, and 129 were

private citizens or representatives of agencies such as colleges and universities, departments of education, publishers, research institutes, etc. A total of 460 districts, schools, and agencies were represented by IRC visitors; 391 from schools and districts, and 69 from other agencies. Table 1 reflects the monthly totals of public and private schools represented, the number of other agencies represented, and the number of IRC visitors from each. A monthly listing of visitors by IRC is summarized in Appendix A.

TABLE 1

IRC Visitor Information

Month	School or District (Public and Private)		Other Agencies* or Private Citizens		Total	
	No. of Districts/ Schools	No. of Persons	No. of Agencies	No. of Persons	Districts and Agencies	Persons
Sept.	2	9	2	4	4	13
Oct.	19	73	5	5	24	78
Nov.	32	89	11	12	43	101
Dec.	60	178	5	9	65	187
Jan.	50	169	12	15	62	184
Feb.	64	177	8	16	72	193
Mar.	62	219	9	11	71	230
Apr.	39	194	9	42	48	236
May	62	277	8	15	70	292
June	1	2			1	2
TOTAL	391	1,387	69	129	460	1,516

*Colleges and universities, departments of education, publishing companies, research institutes, etc.

IRC Activities

The staff of each center conducted program orientations, classroom observations, and personal conferences with teachers and administrators of IRC schools. Table 2 presents a monthly summary of the number of orientations conducted, and number of persons participating. A total of 306 orientations were conducted on 286 days for 1,463 persons.

TABLE 2

IRC Orientations

Month	No. Conducted	No. of Days	No. of Persons
Sept.	1	1	2
Oct.	22	16	56
Nov.	35	32	100
Dec.	41	37	183
Jan.	50	48	180
Feb.	36	36	193
Mar.	48	45	228
Apr.	30	30	235
May	42	40	284
June	1	1	2
TOTAL	306	286	1,463

Table 3 shows that 1,275 persons participated in classroom observations at IRC schools; 445 such observation sessions were conducted on 272 days. The table also contains monthly summaries of classroom observations.

TABLE 3

Classroom Observations

Month	No. Conducted	No. of Days	No. of Persons
Oct.	21	15	49
Nov.	58	31	101
Dec.	74	34	186
Jan.	59	45	175
Feb.	42	33	153
Mar.	76	47	222
Apr.	47	26	128
May	67	40	259
June	1	1	2
TOTAL	445	272	1,275

Three hundred eighty-three conferences between IRC visitors and IRC school district personnel were conducted on 279 days. A total of 1,284 visitors participated in these conferences. Table 4 presents a monthly summary of conference information.

TABLE 4

Conferences

Month	No. Conducted	No. of Days	No. of Persons
Oct.	21	15	71
Nov.	53	31	99
Dec.	49	33	181
Jan.	61	44	171
Feb.	42	42	153
Mar.	73	47	220
Apr.	33	26	128
May	50	40	259
June	1	1	2
TOTAL	383	279	1,284

Visitor Reactions

Descriptive information was obtained from Visitor Comment Sheets, IRC Follow-up Sheets, IRC Monthly Reports, and IRC Coordinators' Reaction Summaries. The Reaction Summaries were completed following an end-of-year conference of IRC coordinators and SWRL staff associated with the project.

Visitor Comment Sheets. Table 5 shows the number of comment sheets returned by visitors at the IRCs each month, and Tables 6 through 10 list the responses to specific Visitor Comment Sheet items.

TABLE 5

IRC Visitor Comment Sheets

	Jacksonville	Phoenix	Sacramento	San Diego	Springfield	Total
Sept.	--	2	--	--	--	2
Oct.	11	33	12	--	1	57
Nov.	23	23	34	17	5	102
Dec.	5	26	59	24	68	182
Jan.	4	31	39	35	36	145
Feb.	14	73	23	12	18	140
Mar.	21	24	7	36	120	208
Apr.	18	12	12	61	64	167
May	47	40	10	91	80	268
June	2	--	--	--	--	2
TOTAL	145	264	196	276	392	1,273*

*Total number of visitors and number of Visitor Comment Sheets differ because some sheets were not completed or returned. Responses on partially completed comment sheets were included in tabulations.

Table 6 indicates the visitor's original source of information about the KP/IRCs.

Two items on the Visitor Comment Sheets concern visitor objectives for the IRC visit. One item asks what the objective was and the other asks whether the objective was attained. Eleven objective categories emerged from responses to the item regarding visitors objectives. Table 7 shows the number of responses in each of these categories for each month. The most common objective was to obtain general information about the KP; 310 visitors wanted to examine the KP for possible use in their schools.

Only 12 of 1324 respondents indicated the objective for their visit had not been attained; this is reflected in Table 8.

Item number four on the Visitor Comment Sheet asked which activities or materials were either particularly informative or of little value to the visitor. Responses indicated that classroom observations were considered informative and that the filmstrips used in orientations were of least value. Many respondents indicated that the 16mm films used in orientations were very informative although a few indicated they were of little value. Table 9, part a, lists those materials rated "informative" and part b of the table shows the materials and activities felt by some visitors to have less value.

TABLE 6

Responses to Visitor Comment Sheet:
"How did you hear about the SWRL Kindergarten Program and the Information Resource Center?"

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
1	Administrator/Supervisor	1	22	37	95	60	55	118	59	140		587
2	Teacher	1	7	17	13	20	26	27	15	44		170
3	Ginn representative			6	18	8	2	17	11	45	2	109
4	Higher education institution			1	11	3	3	4	50	9		81
5	Letter to the district		2	5	13	7	13	12	4	8		64
6	SWRL representative		9	7	6	10	5	11	8	22		78
7	Educational meeting		1	10	8	8	3	18	6	16		70
8	Educational publication		1	3	4	4	4	18	9	5		48
9	Federal education agency			2	16	13	6		6	2		45
10	News media		5	7	3	4	4	4	5			32
11	Educational organization		5	2	4	3	8		3			25
12	Private citizen		1	1	1	3	7	1	2	7		23
13	County education agency		1	4	1	5		1	1			13
14	State education agency					1		1	1			3
												1,348*

*Multiple responses were included in tabulations.

TABLE 7

Responses to Visitor Comment Sheet:
"What was your objective for the visit?"

	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
1 General information	2	30	62	59	52	75	74	90	105		549
2 Evaluate KP for use		13	15	77	35	37	63	30	40		310
3 Observe reading instruction in Kindergarten		3	19	37	22	11	61	32	59	2	246
4 Improve instructional skills		6	3	9	22	10	8	3	14		75
5 To help implement KP					2			15	46		63
6 To see materials		2	6	14	2	1	5		9		39
7 For program background information		4	4	9	1			2	7		27
8 To receive training			1	3	3	1					8
9 To observe ICP					2	1					3
10 For financial information			1	1					1		3
11 To get material for news article					1						1
											1,324

TABLE 8

Responses to Visitor Comment Sheet:
"Was that objective met?"

	Sept.		Oct.		Nov.		Dec.		Jan.		Feb.		Mar.		Apr.		May		June		TOTAL	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1 General information	2		30		62		59		52		73	2	73	1	89	1	105				545	4
2 Evaluate KP for use			13		15		75	2	35		37		62	1	30		39	1			306	4
3 Observe reading instruction in Kindergarten			3		19		37		22		11		61		32		59		2		246	
4 Improve instructional skills			6		3		9		22		10		8		3		14				75	
5 To help implement KP									2						15		46				63	
6 To see materials			2		5	1	14		2		1		5		9						38	1
7 For program background information			3	1	3	1	9		1						2		7				25	2
8 To receive training					1		3		3		1										8	
9 To observe ICP									2		1										3	
10 For financial information					1			1									1				2	1
11 To get material for news article									1												1	
																					1,312	12

TABLE 9

Responses to Visitor Comment Sheet:
"What specific activities or materials did you find particularly informative or of little value?"

Part a: Informative activities or materials

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
1	Classroom observation	1	15	26	66	55	50	71	47	83		414
2	Films		16	23	31	17	27	23	37	41		215
3	Coordinator's orientation	1	6	14	37	22	16	46	25	21		188
4	Program materials		11	15	20	23	9	35	21	24		158
5	Personal conferences		3	9	13	22	13	45	15	24		144
6	Program activities		2	8	7	4		17	24	14		76
7	Program procedures				3	8	11	27	9	14	1	73
8	Program books		8	6	8	6	6		2	18		53
9	Program structure		1	9	10	5		4	5	15		49
10	Reading instruction		1	1	14	2	2			25		45
11	Games		4	8					1	17		30
12	ICP		4	4	4	5	1	1	4	1		24
13	Filmstrips					5	10		3	6		24

TABLE 9--Continued

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
14	FYCSP			2	4	4	3	6	3	2		24
15	Teacher's file box		7	1	4	1				3		16
16	Assessment		2		4	1	1	2		10		20
17	IRC activities				5		1			8		14
18	PAL					5	2	2		3		12
19	Flashcards		1	2			1			3	1	8
20	Instructional Management System					3	1			2		6
21	Tutorial Program					1				5		6
22	Philosophy underlying KP		1	1	3							5
23	Teacher prepared material							3				3
24	Tutor training materials			1		1						2
25	Oral word index				1	1						2
26	Summer Reading Program									2		2
												1,612

TABLE 9--Continued

Part b: Material or activities considered of little value

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
1	Filmstrips					4	2		8	2		16
2	Films			4	3		1			1		9
3	Program procedures								2	1		3
4	Games (since they are only described)							1				1
5	Didn't understand sequence of phonics					1						1
6	Tutorial Program					1						1
7	Reinforcement procedure			1								1
8	Method of word analysis			1								1
												33

TABLE 10

Responses to Visitor Comment Sheet:
"Additional comments or suggestions"

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
1	KP is very good	1	4	17	19	26	19	26	21	29		163
2	IRC staff very helpful		2	4	20	16	12	24	22	30		109
3	Visit very informative and impressive		4	5	23	10		24	4	40		109
4	Thank you		6	6	9	6	9	19	16	13		84
5	IRC well organized		1	15	20	6	11	8		1		62
6	Teachers & pupils were enthusiastic		1	5	15	6	3	8	7	1		46
7	Would like to use the program		4	3	8		9	6	5	7		42
8	Would like sample materials to examine				8		2		3	5		18
9	Would have liked more time in classroom		1	2	7	1				3		14
10	Would like to visit another school			2		1		7			2	12
11	Programs too structured				1				7	1		9
12	How are slow learners handled				1	2			1	5		8
13	Reinforcement procedures good		4		2				1	1		8

TABLE 10--Continued

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
14	A-V components were redundant		4		1		1			2		8
15	I want my colleagues to visit IRC				3			1	1	1		6
16	KP structure not appropriate for all pupils			1	1		3	1	1			7
17	Aides need more training			5			1					6
18	KP should be thoroughly evaluated			1	3	2						6
19	KP should be more individualized				3			1	1	1		6
20	Would like to hear about other SWRL programs				1	1			2	1		5
21	What is the price			3	1	1						5
22	Procedures should be explained more fully				3			1				4
23	Would like to receive training				1		2			1		4
24	A-V presentation was excellent	1		1		1			1			4
25	KP needs more phonics		1	1				1				3
26	What are parent reactions to KP			1	2							3
27	Would like to see realistic films		1				1	1				3

TABLE 10--Continued

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
28	KP will be considered for adoption			1				1				2
29	KP needs manipulanda		1					1				2
30	Instructional procedures can be used in higher grades			1			1					2
31	It seems like a first-grade program							2				2
32	How do we get federal funds				1	1						2
33	Should develop materials for pre-kindergarten					2						2
34	I will purchase a set							1		1		2
35	Sound films difficult to hear					1			1			2
36	Wanted more technical program information								2			2
37	Do pupils remain happy and alert							1				1
38	KP required planning and orientation							1				1
39	KP cost is too high							1				1

TABLE 10--Continued

		Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	TOTAL
40	Concerned about time requirement for KP							1				1
41	Materials in smaller quantities					1						1
42	Would like to see a file box					1						1
43	Would like to see teachers working alone				1							1

TABLE 11

Responses to IRC Follow-up Sheet

Part a: "Subsequent to your visit, did you contact the Information Resource Center for information or assistance?"

	Yes	No	No Reply	TOTAL
Jacksonville, Florida	36	59	2	97
Phoenix, Arizona	18	38	1	57
Sacramento, California	18	29	1	48
San Diego, California	17	24	1	42
Springfield, Illinois	58	155	4	217
TOTAL	147	305	9	461

TABLE 11--Continued

Part b: "If so, what was the nature of this assistance?"

		Jacksonville, Florida	Phoenix, Arizona	Sacramento, California	San Diego, California	Springfield, Illinois	TOTAL
1	IRC visitation	22	11	4	4	32	73
2	Classroom observation	13	4	6	7	5	35
3	Materials	4		6	4	9	23
4	Request for additional information	5	7		2	7	21
5	Presentation for kindergarten teachers			1	3	5	9
6	Directions to IRC	1		1	1	4	7
7	Films	3		2		1	6
8	Training	1		1	1	1	4
9	Pricing information			1	1	1	3
10	A-V demonstration of SWRL KP		2				2
11	To contact Ginn representative					2	2
12	Discussion with faculty about SWRL KP			1			1
13	To initiate SWRL program				1		1
14	Presentation to college class				1		1
15	Assistance in marketing SWRL KP	1					1

TABLE 11--Continued

Part c: "Was this assistance provided promptly and effectively?"

	Yes	No	TOTAL
Jacksonville, Florida	37	0	37
Phoenix, Arizona	19	0	19
Sacramento, California	20	0	20
San Diego, California	16	0	16
Springfield, Illinois	58	0	58
TOTAL	150	0	150

TABLE 12

Responses to IRC Follow-up Sheet

Part a: "Are any of the SWRL Kindergarten Program systems being considered or recommended for use in your district?"

	Yes	No	Unsure	TOTAL
Jacksonville, Florida	55	19	7	81
Phoenix, Arizona	22	28	4	54
Sacramento, California	30	13	3	46
San Diego, California	35	4	0	39
Springfield, Illinois	135	57	16	208
TOTAL	277	121	30	428

TABLE 12--Continued

Part b: "If so, please indicate the systems being considered."

	Jacksonville FL	Phoenix AZ	Sacramento CA	San Diego CA	Springfield IL	TOTAL
First-Year Communication Skills Program	43	18	30	29	111	231
Instructional Concepts Program	49	22	25	27	100	223
Parent-Assisted Learning Program	17	12	11	12	69	121
Tutorial Program	17	11	10	9	54	101
Summer Reading Program	14	12	7	7	33	73
TOTAL	140	75	83	84	367	749

TABLE 13

Responses to IRC Follow-up Sheet:
"If the SWRL Kindergarten Program is not being recommended for use in your district, what considerations affected this decision?"

	Jacksonville FL	Phoenix AZ	Sacramento CA	San Diego CA	Springfield IL	TOTAL
1 Lack of funds	5	1	7	5	16	34
2 Current kindergarten curriculum adequate	2	6	6		15	29
3 Another program in use	4	5	2	3	11	25
4 SWRL KP inconsistent with district philosophy	1	11			3	15
5 District does not offer kindergarten	5	1				6
6 Time factor involved		1			4	5
7 SWRL KP not adopted by state department of education		4				4
8 SWRL KP not applicable to population			2		2	4
9 More information needed					3	3
10 Observation of SWRL KP at IRC			2			2
11 SWRL KP not under consideration by state department of education			1			1
12 Federal Incentive Program requires too large a commitment	1					1

TABLE 13--Continued

	Jacksonville FL	Phoenix AZ	Sacramento CA	San Diego CA	Springfield IL	TOTAL
13 Internal problems					1	1
14 Kindergarten teachers not ready for change					1	1
15 SWRL KP too costly	1					1

The final item on the Visitor Comment Sheet asked for any additional comments or suggestions that respondents felt were pertinent concerning their visit to the IRC. The most common responses were general positive statements concerning the KP, visits to the IRC, and IRC personnel. Responses to this item are presented in Table 10.

Follow-up sheets. IRC Follow-up Sheets were developed to provide evaluative information to aid in planning additional follow-up activities. They were mailed in March, 1972, to individuals who had visited the centers. Four hundred and six IRC Follow-up Sheets were completed by former visitors and returned to the Centers. Item one in the Follow-up Sheet contains three parts. The first asks if the visitor contacted the IRC for information or assistance following his visit. The second asks the nature of the desired assistance, and the final part asks whether the assistance was provided promptly and effectively. Responses to item one are shown in Table 11, parts a, b and c. The majority of those responding to the IRC Follow-up Sheets indicated that they did not contact the IRC for information or assistance subsequent to their visit. The most common response by those who requested information or assistance was to schedule additional visits to the centers. Table 11, part c, indicates that assistance was provided promptly and effectively in all cases.

Item two on the Follow-up Sheet asks whether any SWRL KP was being considered or recommended for use in the visitor's district. Responses to this item, shown in Table 12, indicate that one or more of the KP systems were being considered for use in the districts of most respondents. Table 12, part b, indicates those systems being considered for district use.

The final item on the IRC Follow-up Sheet is addressed to those individuals indicating that KP was not being recommended for district use. Table 13 presents the various considerations affecting district decisions not to use KP.

Coordinator Reactions

Following their end-of-year meeting at the Laboratory, coordinators responded to several questions regarding the year's IRC experience. The first question was:

> What major changes in expectation did you experience as you began the operation of your Center?

Coordinators noted concerns in two areas: 1) visitations, and 2) materials.

Two coordinators were concerned with the initial small number of visitors. Another coordinator reported a large number of visitation requests. She indicated concern over meeting the requests and keeping each visitation day on schedule.

Coordinators were pleased with the materials received for display and dissemination, but an earlier material delivery would have reduced initial concerns in this area. The Local Education Agencies Report and SWRL Technical Reports 28 and 31 aided coordinators in answering questions central to the development of SWRL programs.

The second question on the Coordinator Reaction Summary was:

> What suggestions would you make for IRC program modification (materials, procedures, facilities, staffing, budget, etc.) should a similar program be established at some time to stimulate installation of another product.

Coordinators suggested providing sample materials such as criterion exercises, practice exercises, and flashcards. Closer communication and cooperation among IRC's in meeting the individual needs of inquirers was also suggested.

Facilities, budget, and staffing of IRC's were considered adequate. Unanimously, coordinators appreciated the useful and flexible procedural guidelines for operating the Centers.

The third question of the summary was:

> What suggestions would you make for modification of the initial IRC Coordinator's Planning session?

Coordinators felt that the initial planning session was helpful and informative.

Additional comments of the IRC coordinators were:

1. Program Orientations: It might be helpful, when new materials are presented, to have Resource people, such as teachers who have used them, present to answer questions and perhaps teach a lesson using the materials. Usually there is so much to assimilate that such a plan might prove to be very helpful to visitors.

2. We have had so many comments from visitors expressing appreciation for the opportunity to learn about a new program in this way. They have said it is so much more beneficial and meaningful to have the program initially presented using audiovisual aids and then to visit classrooms and see the program in action.

3. This has been a most exciting, beneficial and rewarding year for which I am very grateful. It has not been difficult to present a program which I thoroughly believe to be a most outstanding one.

4. It's been an informative year--gained as much knowledge as I imparted.

5. Thanks for all the encouragement and help given by the Laboratory.

DEVELOPMENT FORMULATION IMPLICATIONS

The prime motivation for SWRL in assuming responsibility for the IRC contract was its potential for furthering the development of generalizable installation procedures pertinent to research-based instructional products. The demand within the educational community to "see the product in action" is loud. Experience with the IRCs suggests that the bark may be louder than the bite, but in the foreseeable future a large sector of the educational community will use any lack of provision for "seeing the product" as sufficient basis for rejecting it forthwith. There appears no good reason to fight this demand so long as it can be fulfilled at justifiable cost. This section analyzes the cost implications that follow from the experience with the 1971-72 IRCs.

IRC Benefits

Let us consider first the "benefits" of the IRCs. The IRCs did function well in further informing the educational community about the KP. The participating districts and the broader school and higher education communities all found the IRCs useful. Moreover, the costs of the IRCs in each district were about as low as one could reasonably expect. Given the nature of the IRCs, two professional persons and one clerical person were both the minimum required to reasonably handle the IRC core workload and the maximum that an IRC subcontract would provide.

Cost Analysis

If a function is necessary and its fulfillment costs are reasonable, one might conclude that no cost problems will arise. But such a conclusion would ignore the implications of cost-per-unit and cost-of-extension consideration.

Cost-per-unit analysis. The cost-per-visitor for the IRCs was $120. Even if visitor volume were doubled or tripled, this unit cost would still be difficult to justify. And even with all imaginable cost trimming and volume incrementing, cost-per-visitor would still be high. A unit cost analysis can be made to look reasonable if it is assumed that each visitor represents a much larger constituency than actually is the case. But, as IRC visitor data in Appendix A indicate, this is not the case.

Cost-of-extension analysis. Five IRCs were insufficient to provide balanced national coverage. What represents adequate national coverage is arbitrary, but 20 centers would by any standards be minimal. This results in an aggregate cost of $720,000 per product. This cost would be reasonable if it represented total KP advertising costs, but Follow-up Sheet data in Table 11 suggest that only a small fraction of visits can be directly tied to specific sales.

Future IRC Establishment

In view of these data the conclusion is inescapable that although the IRCs reflected the most efficient "instructional product demonstration in use" that can be provided, that providing this function within the present state-of-the-art is prohibitively expensive and should not again be attempted without further advancing the state-of-the-art in this area. Fortunately, the data generated in connection with establishing and operating the IRCs in 1971-72 provide the basis for developing future installation procedures that will make it possible to accomplish "visiting" functions for research-based products while avoiding the costs of treating the function as a separately costed project. The forms and procedures used in the IRCs were carefully designed to be generalizable. Using these prototype materials it is now feasible to develop a component for an instructional program that will permit each local educational agency to establish its own "IRC" for the program.

One of the inherent features of a well-developed product is that it makes all persons associated with its use "look good." It would appear that there is sufficient motivation within the school administrative community for putting into action workable procedures that increase the public visibility of instructional success. In some cases it may be necessary to subsidize incremental IRC costs modestly. But it would appear that the publisher who will distribute the materials might well be willing to provide this stimulation.

When the 1971-72 IRCs are viewed as a development effort, the cost/benefit analysis appears highly favorable. Given the information acquired in this experience, it should never again be necessary to replicate the same architecture for "informing the educational community" of a research-based product. It will, however, be possible to perform this function at reduced cost, with at least the same and likely with increased effectiveness.

APPENDIX A

Monthly Visitors to Each IRC

JACKSONVILLE IRC

October

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Duval County School Board*		9
Lake City		3
Gainesville		2
Subtotal	3	14
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Jacksonville Community Planning Council		1
Florida State Department of Education		1
Subtotal	2	2
TOTAL	5	16

November

District		
Duval County		16
Dade County		1
Wichita, Kansas		1
Subtotal	3	18
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Jacksonville University		1
Ginn and Company		1
SWRL		1
Subtotal	3	3
TOTAL	6	21

*Schools and districts with no state designation are located in state of IRC.

December

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Jefferson Township School System, New Jersey		1
Scott Mill Lane Kindergarten		1
Alachua County		4
Subtotal	3	6
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	3	6

January

District		
St. Paul's Catholic School, Jacksonville Beach		2
East Windsor Board of Education Broad Brook, Connecticut		1
Subtotal	2	3
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Robert Davis Association		1
Florida State Department of Education		1
Ginn and Company		3
Subtotal	3	5
TOTAL	5	8

February

District		
Normandy Park Baptist Kindergarten		1
Woodstock Park Baptist Kindergarten		1

February--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
New Albany City Schools, MS		5
Orange County, The Gateway School, Orlando		2
Happy Time Kindergarten, Mayport Naval Sta., FL		3
Massapequa, Long Island, NY		1
Subtotal	6	13
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Research for Better Schools, Inc., Phil., PA		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	7	14

March

District		
Cajon Valley School District, CA		1
Alachua County		4
Tuscumlua Public Schools, AL		2
Bay County		4
Drew, MS		1
Canal Zone Schools, CZ		1
Nassau County		5
Mt. Vernon, NY		1
Duval County		2
Subtotal	9	21
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
USOE		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	10	22

April

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Martin County Schools		3
Clay County Schools		1
Cabell County Schools		1
Blessed Soc. Catholic School, Atlanta, GA		4
Alabama Street Day Care Center, Atlanta, GA		1
Day Care Center, Dalton, GA		1
Westminister Schools, Atlanta, GA		1
Atlanta City School District		2
Auburn City Schools		1
Duval County ICS Center		1
Subtotal	10	16
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Appalachian Comission		1
Miami-Dade Junior College		1
Subtotal	2	2
TOTAL	12	18

May

District	
Southwestern City Schools, Columbus, OH	1
Lakeshore Kindergarten, Jacksonville	2
Memphis City Schools, TN	6
Birmingham Public Schools, AL	2
Diocese of Mobile, AL	1
Diocese of Birmingham, AL	1
Tuscaloosa County, AL	1
Jefferson County, AL	3
Orange County	7
Martin County	3
Jacksonville	1
Brevard County	3
Fun Day Kindergarten	1

May--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Leflare County, MS		1
Laural, MS		1
Meridan, MS		1
Jackson, MS		3
Saltillo, MS		1
Corinth City Schools, MS		1
Alcorn County Schools, MS		1
Subtotal	20	41
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Ginn and Company		2
University of Alabama		1
Memphis State University		1
Private Citizen		1
University of South Mississippi		1
Subtotal	5	6
TOTAL	25	47

June

District		
First Baptist Church School, AL		2
Subtotal	1	2
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	1	2

PHOENIX IRC

September

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Phoenix Elementary School District #1		8
Fowler School District		1
Subtotal	2	9
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
SWRL		2
Arizona State University		2
Subtotal	2	4
TOTAL	4	13

October

District		
Phoenix Elementary School District #1		17
Madison		3
Kingman		2
La Senita		1
Campo Bella School		1
Paradise Valley District #69		1
Cartwright		10
Phoenix Day Nursery		5
Alhambra		3
Roosevelt District		1
Murphy		2
Subtotal	11	46
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Batswana, Africa		1
Department of Education		1
Subtotal	2	2
TOTAL	13	48

November

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Washington		5
Phoenix Elementary District #1		1
Bisbee School District		3
Ray		4
Alhambra		1
Ajo School District		1
Casa Grande Elementary		2
Litchfield Park		2
Subtotal	8	19
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Arizona State University		2
Arizona Republic (Newspaper)		1
Subtotal	2	3
TOTAL	10	22

December

District		
Scottsdale		1
Washington		1
Tempe		9
Hudson		1
Coolidge		3
Madison Heights		3
Madison District #1 and #2		1
Roosevelt		1
Cartwright		3
Subtotal	9	23
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Arizona State Department of Education		2
Arizona State University		2
SWRL		1
Subtotal	3	5
TOTAL	12	28

January

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Madison #1		8
Guiding Light School		1
Phoenix Elementary District #1		5
Prescott		1
Davis, Farmington, UT		1
Civic East Opportunity Day Care		2
Walnut Grove		1
Parents Ed. and Preschool, Calaraela		1
Catalina Foothills, Tucson		2
Omega		7
Pearce		1
Subtotal	11	30
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
American Weekly Newspaper		1
USOE		1
Far West Laboratory		1
NCEC		1
American University		1
Subtotal	5	5
TOTAL	16	35

February

District	
Balsz	1
Creighton	5
Douglas	2
Flagstaff	2
Glendale	2
Globe	2
Isaac	2
Kyrene	1
Madison	3
Mesa	2
Miami	3
Nogales	2
Parker	3
Prescott	5
Roosevelt	2
Snowflake	2
Superior	4

February--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Whiteriver		1
Wickenburg		3
Wilcox		2
Phoenix Elementary District #1		11
Parsippany, NJ		1
Bisbee #2		2
Casa Grande Elementary		4
Valle Del Sol		3
Subtotal	25	70
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Arizona Republic		2
Northern Arizona University		8
Early Child. Ed. of Minnesota		1
Arizona Department of Education		1
Subtotal	4	12
TOTAL	29	82

March

District		
Osborn		1
Boulder Valley		1
Chandler		1
Webster Grove, MO		1
Prescott #1		8
Flagstaff		1
N.A.V. Elementary School		2
Madison Heights		1
Wickenburg		1
Private School		1
Phoenix Elementary		2
Subtotal	11	20

March--Continued

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Arizona State University		2
Reading Reform Foundation		1
Subtotal	2	3
TOTAL	13	23

April

District		
McKinley County, Gallup, New Mexico		5
Balsz		1
Osborn District		1
District #97, Deer Valley		1
Buckeye		2
Subtotal	5	10
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Arizona State Department of Education		1
Private Citizen		1
Subtotal	2	2
TOTAL	7	12

May

District		
Phoenix Elementary #1		23
Amphitheater, Tucson		9
Osborn		2
Indian Oasis #40		3
St. Catherine		1
Subtotal	5	38
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Morgan State College		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	6	39

SACRAMENTO IRC

October

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Dixon Unified School District		4
Laguna Salada Unified		4
River Delta Joint Union		1
Center Joint Unified		3
Subtotal	4	12
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Sacramento State College		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	5	13

November

District		
San Juan Unified		5
Spokane, WA		1
Kirkland, WA		1
Calaveras Unified		2
Vallecito Union Elementary		2
Washington Unified		5
Yuba City Unified		3
The Learning Center		2
Sacramento City Unified		5
Folsom-Cordova Unified		1
Center Joint Unified		2
Rio Linda Unified		1
North Sacramento Unified		1
Elverta Joint Unified		1
Dry Creek		1
Subtotal	15	33
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Sacramento County Office of Education		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	16	34

December

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Laguna Salada Unified		8
Elk Grove Unified		1
Dixon Unified		1
Davis Joint Unified		5
Washoe County, NV		3
Tacoma Public Schools, WA		1
San Juan Unified		3
Eureka Union		1
Sacramento City Unified		1
Modesto City Unified		6
Vallejo City Unified		4
Hamilton Elementary		2
Willits Unified		3
Chico Unified		6
Woodland Joint Unified		5
Colusa Unified		2
Enterprise Elementary		1
Oroville Elementary		5
Subtotal	18	58
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	18	58

January

District		
Sacramento City Unified		11
Auburn Union		2
Travis Unified		4
Pacific Grove Unified		1
Travis AFB Elementary		3
Rio Linda Union Elementary		1
Robla School District		2
Alum Rock Union Elementary		7
Canton Municipal Separate District, Canton, MS		3
Subtotal	9	34

January--Continued

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
California Department of Education		1
Private citizen		1
Subtotal	2	2
TOTAL	11	36

February

District		
Mt. Diablo Unified		2
Travis Unified		6
Elk Grove Unified		3
Pittsburg Unified		4
Sacramento City Unified		1
Washington Unified		1
Esparto Unified		2
Pacific Grove Unified		1
Rio Linda Unified		1
Tracy Unified		3
Subtotal	10	24

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Sacramento County Office of Education		2
Subtotal	1	2
TOTAL	11	26

March

District		
Yakima, WA		2
Ashland, OR		1
Cupertino Union		2
Rio Linda		3
Sacramento City Unified		2
Subtotal	5	10

March--Continued

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	5	10

April

District		
Laguna Salada Unified		1
Placerville Union		2
Woodland Joint Union		8
Subtotal	3	11
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
California College of Arts and Crafts		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	4	12

May

District		
Sacramento City Unified		3
Western Placer Unified		2
Chico Unified		4
Esparto Unified		2
Hamilton Union		1
Subtotal	5	12
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	5	12

SAN DIEGO IRC

November

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
San Diego		5
Chino Unified		5
Hemet Unified		6
Subtotal	3	16
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Department of Education, San Francisco Catholic Diocese		1
Subtotal	1	1
TOTAL	4	17

December

District		
San Diego		3
Traver Elementary		2
Lakeside Union		5
Poway Unified		6
Santa Ana Unified		2
Tustin Elementary		3
El Centro		5
Subtotal	7	26
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	7	26

January

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
San Diego Unified		8
Lakeside Union		2
Bakersfield City Schools		4
Buena Vista		1
Vista Unified		9
Poway Unified		2
La Mesa-Spring Valley		2
Cajon Valley		1
Magnolia		6
Rim of the World Unified		1
Subtotal	10	36
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	10	36

February

District		
Jeddan, Saudi Arabia		1
San Diego Unified		9
Monroe, Key West, FL		1
Pacific Grove Unified		1
Subtotal	4	12
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	4	12

March

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Hemet Unified		4
San Diego Unified		18
Mt. Diablo		1
Richmond		1
Santee		1
Los Angeles USD		3
Orcutt Union		1
Carmel Unified		1
Indian Wells Valley Joint Union		2
Montgomery County, MD		1
Subtotal	10	33
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
San Diego State College		2
Representative of Federal Government		1
Subtotal	2	3
TOTAL	12	36

April

District		
Los Angeles USD		60
San Diego USD		22
LaMesa - Spring Valley Unified		7
Subtotal	3	89
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
San Diego State College		30
Northwest Regional Laboratory		2
Subtotal	2	32
TOTAL	5	121

May

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
San Diego Unified		34
El Centro		1
Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes		1
Murrieta		1
La Mesa - Spring Valley		39
Cajon Valley		1
Newport Mesa		2
Sacramento City School District		13
Subtotal	8	92
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	8	92

SPRINGFIELD IRC

October

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Community Unit 300, Princeton, IL		1
Subtotal	1	1
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	1	1

November

District		
Rochester Unit		1
Oak Hill		1
Parkway District, Chesterfield, MO		1
Subtotal	3	3
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
University of Texas		1
Xerox Corporation		1
Illinois Office of Public Instruction		1
USOE		1
Subtotal	4	4
TOTAL	7	7

December

District		
Savanna Community Unified #300		3
Christ the King, #186		4
Granite City #9		5
Dunlap #323		1
Morton Unit District #709		

December--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Washington		2
District #108		1
Normal, IL		5
St. Agnes School		1
St. Aloysius		2
Edwards Co. Community School Unit #1		1
Streator Elementary District #45		3
District #88		5
Mehlville, MO		5
Moline #40		3
Rock Island #41		4
Nauvoo-Calusa #325		4
Ferguson-Florissant		3
District #109		3
St. Louis Public Schools		2
Aurora (East) District #131		3
Harlem District, Rockford		2
District #87, Bloomington		2
Subtotal	23	65
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Ginn and Company		3
Office of Catholic Education		1
Subtotal	2	4
TOTAL	25	69

January

District		
Divernon Community Unit District #13		1
Gary District #1, Gary, IN		2
RIV District, St. Elizabeth, MO		1
District #186		4
South Tania School District, Tama, IA		5
Meredosia Grade School		1
Virden School District #4		3
School District #151, South Holland		2
District #61, Decatur		23
Lindbergh School District, St. Louis, MO		1

January--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
School District of Clayton, Clayton, MO		1
Brown Co. Community District #1, Sterling		2
District #150, Peoria		14
Wyoming Public Schools, Wyoming, MI		6
Illiopolis District #12, Illiopolis		1
Linn-Mar-Indian Creek, Mariam, IA		4
District #181, East St. Louis, IL		3
Subtotal	18	66
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
Newspaper Editor (Advance)		1
Ginn Representative		2
Subtotal	2	3
TOTAL	20	69

February

District		
District #232, Dunlap		6
District #34, Glenview		1
School District #61, Decatur		6
District #150, Peoria		20
Tri-City Elementary School		1
District #217, Abington		2
Walnut		2
District #300, Savanna		4
Wheaton Public Schools		2
District #23, Chicago		1
District #14, Chicago		1
District #8, Chicago		1
East Cleveland City Schools		1
Chicago Board of Education		4
George Washington Elementary School, Moorehead, MN		1
Hawland School District #19		1
McCarkle Elementary School District #13		1
Jensen Elementary School District #8		1
Subtotal	19	56

February--Continued

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Murray State University		2
Model Cities Program Office		1
Subtotal	2	3
TOTAL	21	59

March

District		
Decatur District #61		17
District #206, Stockton		2
Berrien Springs, MI		2
Lakeshore Schools, Stevensville, MI		2
Community Unit #4, Virden		2
Cedar Falls, IA		4
District #40, Moline		16
District #52, WA		5
District #34, Waukegan		4
District #324, Farmington		6
District #8, Pona		1
District #400, Alexis		2
District #222, Monmouth		1
District #38, Monmouth		1
District #117, Jacksonville		6
District #163, Park Forest		6
Delvan S.D., Delvan		4
Rock Island S.D. #41, Rock Island		17
District #95, Paris		3
Cedar Rapids, IA		6
District #13, Chicago		5
District #23, Chicago		5
Blackwater, MO		1
District #50, WA		7
School District, Macomb		4
District #86, East Peoria		3
Galien Elementary School, Galien, MI		3
Subtotal	27	135

Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)	
Student	1
Ginn Publishing Co.	2
Sangamon State University	1

March--Continued

	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Subtotal	3	4
TOTAL	30	139

April

District		
Moline School District #40		10
School District, Ferguson, MO		10
School District, Kankakee		4
School District, Wheaton		6
School District, Springfield		2
District #61, Decatur		3
District #277, Mound, MN		1
School District, East Lincoln		2
District #60, Waukegan		2
Mt. Zion Unit, Mt. Zion		3
School District, Spenserville		1
District #336, Dallas City		2
District #101, Batavia		2
School District, South Holland		6
School District, Joy		1
District #33, West Chicago		3
District #172, Quincy		8
La Fayette Unit S.D., Taulon		2
Subtotal	18	68
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
University of Wisconsin		2
Black Hawk, Moline		3
Subtotal	2	5
TOTAL	20	73

May

District		
Mehlville S.D., St. Lewis, MO		13
School District, Litchfield		8
School District, Indianapolis		7
Quincy Public Schools		5

May--Continued

District	District/ Agency	Number of Visitors
Community Unit #1, Payson		2
Moline Public Schools		4
Bettendorf Schools, Bettendorf, IA		1
District #150, Peoria		6
Kirkwood Public Schools, Kirkwood, MO		5
Linn-Mar Community Schools, Marion, IA		4
Community Unit #201, Aleda		1
Anamosa Community Schools, Anamosa, IA		1
Menomissee Ava Public School, MI		1
Whitehall School District, MI		4
School District, Lowell, IN		6
District #158, Lansing		3
Board of Education, Zanesville, OH		1
Decatur S.D., Decatur		1
District #45, Streator		7
Muncie Community Schools, Muncie, IN		2
Huntington Community Schools, IN		1
School District, Dayton, OH		2
Normandy School District, St. Louis, MO		5
School District #122, LaSalle		4
Subtotal	24	94
Other Agencies (Higher Ed. Inst., Depts. of Ed., Pub. Co. Reps.)		
None		0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL	24	94